

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17, and 43-46 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 14 are amended to clarify that the claimed invention is intended for consumer copies of portions of books. Claims 35-42 were withdrawn. Claim 47 is canceled.

The Office Action rejected claim 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 47, because claim 47 is canceled.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-17 and 43-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,742,039 to Sato et al. ("Sato") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,991,876 to Johnson et al. ("Johnson") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,486,780 to Garber et al. "(Garber").

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-17 and 43-46, because the references do not teach or suggest all of the claimed elements.


The Office Action states "Sato and Johnson fail to teach or disclose affixing a semiconductor device to a book as now claimed" and attempts to add the RF tag in Garber for this element. (Office Action, page 3, paragraph no. 5). However, the features of the RF tag in Garber are not the same as the claimed semiconductor device. The RF tag in Garber requires supporting devices, such as readers, hand-held devices, computer system databases, and other mechanisms. (Garber, col. 14 line 58 to col. 18 line 38). By contrast, the claimed semiconductor device alone stores a record of copy orders and notifies a copy tracker. Furthermore, Garber discloses performing inventory control ("interrogate and identify"; "locate items") with RF tags, such as tracking library books in a library. (Garber, col. 14 line 58 to col. 18 line 38). By contrast, the claimed invention

fills orders for consumer rights to make copies of a book. Garber is directed to a different problem than the claimed invention. Thus, the combination of Garber, Sato and Johnson does not teach or suggest all of the claimed elements.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims in the present application are patentably distinguishable over the references cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that the claims be passed to allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 1-4-04



Paul D. Greeley  
Reg. No. 31,019  
Attorney for Applicants  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
(203) 327-4500